



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,707	02/15/2001	Angelo Bastioli	13929/TBA	3139

38834 7590 06/30/2005

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP  
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW  
SUITE 700  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

CHANG, VICTOR S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/784,707

Applicant(s)

BASTIOLI ET AL.

Examiner

Victor S. Chang

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/2/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,7,8,10-32,39 and 40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,7,8,10-32,39 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Introduction***

1. The Examiner has carefully considered Applicants' amendments and remarks filed on 6/2/2005. Applicants' amendments to claim 1, and cancellation of claims 33-38 and 41-45 have been entered.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Rejections not maintained are withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10-32, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, it is noted that the term "maize" in claim 1 has been amended as "ordinary maize". However, Applicants fail to provided any express support in the specification, nor does the Examiner find such term being inherently disclosed by the

original specification. As such, it appears to be new matter. Applicants are required to cancel the new matter, or provide an express or inherent support for it.

***Rejections Based on Prior Art***

4. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10-32, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altieri (US 5153037), generally as set forth in section 5 of Office action dated 2/3/2005, together with the following response to argument.

First, it is noted that claim 1 has been amended to recite "ordinary maize", which appears to be a possible new matter, as set forth above.

Second, Applicants' argument "Altieri teaches that at least 45 w% amylase is required in its invention. This is a teaching away from the starches set forth in claim 1 ... The point of novelty if applicants invention is not only the specific starches, but also the claimed cell size, cell size distribution and intrinsic viscosity in DMSO. Altieri does not disclose these features, nor would Altieri suggest or inherently provide these features as Altieri suggest or inherently provide these features as Altieri teaches away from the present invention" (Remarks, page 13, third paragraph) has been carefully considered, but is not persuasive. The Examiner repeats (see Office action dated 7/26/2004, page 3, first full paragraph, last three lines) that "if less than 45 wt% amylose is the point of novelty, the Examiner respectfully reminds Applicants that this limitation is absent from the claims of the instant invention."

Second, the Examiner also repeats (see Office action dated 4/10/2003, page 2, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph) that while Altieri lacks an express teaching of the aforementioned

properties (i.e., cell size/distribution and intrinsic viscosity in DMSO), since Altieri teaches the same subject matter (i.e., expanded destructured or complexed starch) and for the same application (a biodegradable packaging material) as the instant invention, it is the Examiner's position that, in the absence of unexpected results, these properties are either anticipated by Altieri, or obviously provided once the product is made. It should be noted that where the claimed and prior art products are shown to be identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. See MPEP § 2112.01.

Finally, in the absence of any evidentiary support by Applicants, the Examiner also notes it is well settled that unexpected results must be established by factual evidence. Attorney arguments cannot take the place of evidence.


### ***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor S. Chang whose telephone number is 571-272-1474. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel H. Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1771

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Victor S Chang  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1771

6/24/2005